DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 401 TM 017 048

AUTHOR Hall, Gene E.; George, Archie
TITLE Development of a Framework and Measure for Assessing Principal Change Facilitator Style.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; *Change Agents; Educational Change; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Field Tests; Foreign Countries; *Instructional Leadership; Likert Scales; Mail Surveys; *Principals; Questionnaires; Secondary School Teachers; Teacher Attitudes; *Test Construction
IDENTIFIERS *Change Facilitator Style Questionnaire; Facilitators; Netherlands; *Teacher Surveys; United States

ABSTRACT

A framework is proposed for describing the underlying dimensions of different styles that principals have as facilitators of change. A measure, the Change Facilitator Style Questionnaire, was developed to assess these dimensions and change facilitator styles. A review of the literature suggested an organizing framework of the following dimensions: (1) concern for people; (2) organizational efficiency; and (3) strategic sense. Two poles were determined for each dimension. A six-point Likert-type scale was designed for teacher assessment of each item, and 12 to 14 items were developed for each pole of each dimension. In the fall of 1987, field test packets were prepared or distributed in English and Dutch versions. In all, 679 responses representing 46 schools were received in the United States, with local rates of response varying from 95% to 36%. The field test confirmed the usefulness of the structure, and items tended to have consistency within each cluster. The next steps in the development of the measure will be to refine the scoring system, conduct a validity study, and review the Dutch field study. Two figures describe the styles and dimensions. A 25-item list of references is included. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

GENE E. HALL

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED336401

Development of a Framework and Measure for Assessing Principal Change Facilitator Style.[1]

Gene E. Hall
College of Education
University of Northern Colorado
Greely, Colorado

Archie George
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho

As the 1980's have unfolded there have been a number of intensive studies of school principals as instructional leaders. Out of these major studies has emerged a common set of understandings about the role of the principal, descriptions of the emphases that they take and the relationship of their practice to school effectiveness, student achievement and teacher success in implementing educational innovations. Given the consistency in the findings from these recent studies that the time is right to begin to develop an organizing framework that addresses key dimensions of the principal's role in school improvement. This framework can then be used to construct measures that are specially designed for the school context. The foundation for this work would be the data and findings from the recent rich and intensive descriptive studies.

In developing such a framework and measurement system it would be important also to take into account the long history of theory development, model building and measurement of leaders and leadership in private sector settings. There is an extensive history of examining the role of leaders in companies, organizations as well as in laboratory settings. Across time different assumptions have been held about the characteristics of leaders, the possibilities of training leaders and the critical elements in their influence. However, the studies that have been done in private sector settings cannot simply be transferred to the professional organization of a school.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, Louisiana, April, 1988.

TM011048

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teachers are not working in the same context or with the same functions as assembly line workers, military personnel or agency volunteers. The principal's relationship with teachers is not the same as managers and their followers. However the knowledge base and literature that have been developed in industrial psychology clearly include elements and aspects that are relevant and must be considered in examining the role of the principal as an instructional leader.

In summary, the time is right to begin the development of models of effective leadership in education settings. To do this will mean addressing the principals leadership role in the special context of the school and also to address the "business of schools", that is teaching and learning. Developing such an organizing framework and related measures is the goal of the joint research and development effort that is being reported in this paper and a companion paper by Vandenberghe (1988).

In the work to be reported in this paper, a newly conceived organizing framework is proposed for describing the underlying dimensions of different principal change facilitator styles. The development of a measure for assessing these underlying dimensions and change facilitator styles is presented also. The measure, the Change Facilitator Style Questionnaire, has been designed to be completed by teachers. The results of analyses of the teachers responses yield scores on three dimensions, the interpretation of which is guided by the conceptual framework and earlier research on principal change facilitator styles.

This paper begins with a review of studies of principals and selected aspects of studies of leadership in industry, then the organizing framework is introduced. This is followed by a description of the development of the Change Facilitator Style Questionnaire and initial field testing. The paper concludes with a brief discussion of implications for research and practice.

Studies of Leadership

There is a long and rich history of studies of leaders, especially in industrial and military settings. One indication of the extensiveness of this work is the summary and analysis compiled by Bass (1981), which is nearly one thousand pages in length. Systematic studies of principals as leaders are more recent. The early principal studies borrowed heavily from the leadership studies in industrial and organizational psychology. However, the most recent studies of principals have emphasized the special context and mission of schools.

Principal Studies

In a 1982 analysis of the "empirical research on principals" Greenfield observed, "In short, most studies (of the principal) appear to be guided by idealized conceptions of what principals should be like rather than conceptions grounded in observation of actual behavior on the job." pg. 1. Greenfield also pointed out that the primary method of study has been the survey questionnaire. He points out, "While there has been more research on the principalship during the past decade than in previous periods, the bulk of the studies are aimed neither at the solution of pragmatic policy problems nor at the generation of theory related to understanding the principalship" pg. 1

During the time that Greenfield would have been preparing his review the newer studies of school principals were undergoing a major paradigm shift. There was a movement were surveys and away from one time data collections. There were moves toward more qualitative methodologies, in-depth data collection, over time in a few schools, and, most importantly, a focus on operational definitions of effectiveness that dealt with educational, rather than assembly line, criteria.

Leithwood and Montgomery's 1983 review of "The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement" reflected this paradigm shift. They distinguished between "typical" principals and "effective" principals. They looked for studies that examined ways that the principal influenced student learning. Out of their review they identified several dimensions of principal behavior that were characteristic of the effective principals. Effective principals are concerned with promoting student cognitive growth, relationships with staff and the community are arranged to support student achievement, they are clear about their priorities, they are deeply involved with students and teachers and they maintain their priorities across time.

In a study that was the forerunner of the 1980 paradigm shift Thomas reported in 1978 on a study of principals in more than sixty schools with alternative programs. She identified three patterns or classifications of principal behavior that were related to facilitation of implementation of the alternative program. She named these types: Director, Administrator and Facilitator. The behaviors Thomas described for the Director are similar to those Leithwood and Montgomery identified with the Effective principals. While the Administrator gives teachers autonomy in their classrooms, s/he tends to make the decisions in areas that affect the school as a whole. The Facilitator perceives his/her role as one of supporting teachers, especially as it relates to process.

At nearly the same time, 1977, Brookover and Lezotte published their work on effective schools. The focus of their study was on identifying characteristics of schools where student achievement was improving as compared with schools where

student achievement was declining. In the achieving schools teachers and principals were more likely to assume responsibility for teaching basic reading and math skills and be dedicated to it. The principals were more likely to be instructional leaders and more likely to assume responsibility for the evaluation of achievement.

In 1979 Edmonds summarized much of this research and addressed the specific needs of the urban poor. He concluded, "I want to end this discussion by noting as unequivocally as I can what seem to me the most tangible and indispensable characteristics of effective schools: (a) They have strong administrative leadership without which the disparate elements of good schooling can neither be brought together nor kept together;..." pg 22.

During the 1980-83 period the role of the principal in facilitating implementation was the focus for a series of studies by Hall and his associates at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. Their study of principals developed out of their extensive work in the 1970's on change in schools. In the change studies they had developed measurement procedures for assessing the three diagnostic dimensions of the Concerns Based Adoption Model (Hall, Wallace and Dossett, 1973; Hall and Hord, 1987). These studies had focused on the implementation of educational innovations at the classroom level.

While engaged in the secondary analysis of implementation data collected in one intensive two year study, it became apparent that there were systematic differences in implementation that could not be explained by looking at teacher staff development opportunities, types of students, teacher characteristics or available resources. The hypothesis that emerged from this secondary analysis was that the degree of implementation was different in the different schools because of the concerns and behavior of the school principals (Hall, Hord and Griffin, 1980).

The differences in teachers' implementation at the classroom level made it possible to cluster the study schools into three groups. In looking at what was known about the role of the principals in each of the school groupings it was surprisingly easy to identify systematic ways in which the principals varied in their approach to facilitating their teachers' use of the innovation. Three different styles were inferred: Initiator, Manager and Responder.

The hypotheses that emerged out of this secondary analysis about the "change facilitating style" of the principal were then tested in the year long intensive Principal Teacher Interaction Study (Rutherford 1988). In this study principals were selected based on their being judged to be representative of one of the three hypothesized change facilitator styles. Then, their

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

intervention behaviors were documented on a day to day basis in relation to their role in facilitating their teachers' use of an educational innovation.

Clear and systematic relationships were observed between the CF Style the principal used and their teachers' success in implementing the innovation (Huling, Hall, Hord and Rutheroford, 1983). With the resultant analysis of the intervention data, it was possible to refine the definitions of the three different Change Facilitator Styles and to compile a set of indicators (Hall, Rutherford, Hord and Huling-Austin, 1984). The definitions of the three CF Styles are presented in Figure 1.

The basic design of the Principal Teacher Interaction Study has since been replicated a number of times (Schiller, 1988; Trohoski, 1984; Van der Perre, 1984). In each study the same general pattern to the intervention behaviors has been observed. Further, in each study the same relationships between the Change Facilitator Style of the principal and teacher implementation success has been observed. Implementation is more successful in schools with Initiator and Manager CF style principals.

The CF Styles are clearly related to the studies of Thomas, Brookover and Lezotte, as well as the review of Leithwood and Montgomery. All of these studies address many of the concerns identified by Greenfield. The studies were over time and did not rely on surveys. They dealt with schools and the educational context. They did not begin with theory, but they are rich in descriptive findings and can serve as the basis for the development of theory. A newly developed organizing framework is proposed later in this paper. Before doing this, however, it is necessary to review a part of the leadership theory and model building work that has been done in industrial and organizational psychology.

Two Dimensions of Leadership

The development of models and theories of leadership seem to begin with Lewin and Lippitt in 1938. Their conceptions of Democratic, Autocratic and Laissez-faire leaders continue to be used. Interestingly, many of the characteristics of the Laissez-faire leader are seen in Hall et al's Responder and Thomas' Facilitator. The extreme of the Trust in Others leader is not observed in the Responder, but, within limits, principals using this style do illustrate the archetype.

A related cornerstone in the leadership literature has been the reliance on two-dimensional models. The classic work on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Hemphill, 1950) resulted in the two factors, Consideration and Initiation of Structure. Consideration deals with the extent of the leader's concern with the welfare of the members of the group. Initiation

of Structure addresses the extent to which the leader organizes and defines the work of the group.

A somewhat similar set of dimensions are those of Task Orientation and Relations Orientation. A number of models are based on these two dimensions. The work of Blake and Mouton (1964), Fiedler (1977) and Hersey and Blanchard (1977) have received a great deal of attention in both the research and training areas. Leaders with a high Relations Orientation attend more to the human relations of the group and strive to be friendly and supportive. Leaders with more Task Orientation focus on production, achievement and are goal oriented. An aspect of these models that will be returned to later is the underlying scaling of the dimensions.

With each model there is an assumption that leaders range along the dimension from having a little to a lot of that dimension. The scaling in the Blake and Mouton model, for example, goes from zero to ten, with the "ten-ten" leader representing the optimal balance. The contingency theorist suggest that the balancing of what is optimal needs to be adjusted according to the situation. Yet they still scale the dimensions from a little to a lot. In the framework proposed here we will argue that the dimensions are important, but that this little-to-a-lot scaling has missed an important point about leadership as it relates to facilitating change in schools. We propose instead that the dimensions are bi-polar; that less of some aspects means more of others.

With this brief review it is now possible to introduce the organizing framework for describing different Change Facilitating Styles.

AN ORGANIZING FRAMEWORK

The goal of the most recent research by Roland Vandenberghe and myself has been to develop a measure for assessing principal Change Facilitator Style. Very early in this development effort we recognized that it would not be possible to simply measure the Gestalt style concepts of Responder, Manager and Initiator. These concepts are too global for direct measurement and, as many principals have pointed out, most persons will not be represented clearly as one or another of the styles. Instead, they are apt to represent a merging and blending of the different styles.

In the earlier studies the three styles were simply scaled on a single continuum that ranged from 0-100 points. The stereotypic Responder was marked at the 30 point on the scale, the stereotypic Manager being at the 60 point and the stereotypic Initiator at the 90 point. With this one-dimensional scale the research team developed consensus ratings within the 0-100 range of where each

principal best fit. In the CFSQ measurement development effort, the objective has been to develop a measurement procedure that would not require expert judgement. The dynamics of Responder, Manager and Initiator facilitator styles would need to be preserved while at the same time accommodating greater individual variation in style.

Once it was decided to build a measure that would be independent of an expert judgement and that also would take into account more of the underlying dynamics of the change facilitator styles, it was necessary to take into consideration the history of research in industrial psychology, especially the extensive use of the two dimensions task/structure and relationship/consideration. One problem with the two dimensions of task and relationship was that these dimensions did not take into account all of the dynamics that were addressed in the Change Facilitator Style definitions.

Still given the extensive history of study of the two leadership dimensions, basing the development of a new framework on these made good sense. However the scaling was problematic. As was pointed out above, the task and relationship dimensions are scaled from 0-10. The scaling is interpreted as representing little emphasis at the zero point to having a great deal of emphasis upon the type of behavior and orientation that is described at the ten point. The studies of school principals indicated that their leadership for change did not range from a little to a lot. Instead there was variation in the quality, character and focus of what principals did within each dimension.

Responder style principals tended to exhibit a "relationship" dimension that was friendly, social and open to listening to what teachers had to say. Initiators listened to teachers too, but their attention was consistently focused on teachers ideas about teaching and learning topics. They tended to not engage in informal social chatter but could be very attentative to serious personal issues. Both types of principals' behaviors address a relationship type dimension, but the character of the differences does not fit a low to high scaling.

Similar variation was identified when comparing the task dimension with CF style descriptions. Some principals concentrated heavily on administrative tasks and logistics, taking pride in having their schools run smoothly. Other principals dealt with administrative tasks only when there was time or a demand for attention.

In in order for the CF Framework to work a shift in the scaling was necessary. Along with the scaling shift was a need to redefine the two dimensions. The scales should not run from a little to a lot or low to high, but instead should represent two opposite poles or emphases. Rather than the scale being based on quantity, the variations along the dimension should be

representations of the different orientations that had been observed in Responder, Manager and Initiator CF style principals. The description of a dimension should be in terms of the quality and type of emphasis that is given. If there is variation in intensity this can be developed out of the measurement scoring process, rather than being inherent in the conceptual framework.

It was clear also from the studies of the Initiator style, as well as the continuing emphasis in educational leadership on the importance of principals having vision, that the traditional two dimensional approach would not be sufficient. As we have observed and listened to principals and other leaders talk about their work, and as the emphasis upon reflection has increased (Shone, 19 ; Hall, 1987), the importance of adding a third dimension became all too obvious.

The third dimension would need to deal with the time perspective complexity of thought that the principal places his/her individual actions in. For example, Responder CF style principals were observed to make decisions and intervene in ways that showed little acknowledgment of the larger picture and longer term consequences of their actions. They would announce a special responsibility for a teacher, but not monitor to see if the teacher followed through. They would make a decision one day without anticipating the implications for next week. Initiator CF style principals, on the other hand, would continually think about the interventions they had made and plan the next steps that they would be most useful in moving the school toward their longer term image of what the school should be. This strategic perspective appears to be a major key to the success in change efforts that has been observed in schools with Initiator CF style Principals. To address this dynamic, a third dimension was conceived.

The three dimensions of CFS

With the parameters and alternate emphases outlined, a three dimensional organizing framework came into place. The three dimensions are: 1) Concern for People, 2) Organizational Efficiency and 3) Strategic Sense. The definition of each of these dimensions is presented in Figure 2.

Definition of the CFS dimension poles

Following definition of the overall dimensions, the poles for each dimension were defined. The full definitions of the poles are presented in Figure 2 also.

Pictorially the three dimensions can be seen as follows:

Figure 3: Dimensions of Change Facilitator Style

Concern for People

Social Informal	Formal Meaningful

Organizational Efficiency

Trust in Others	Administrative Efficiency

Strategic Sense

Day to Day	Vision and Planning

This organizing framework accommodates the different emphases and perspectives that have been observed and increases the variations in CF style that can be described. The framework also preserves the three original CF style archetypes. In theory the protypic Responder style would be represented across the three dimensions by being scaled toward the Social Informal, Trust in Others and Day to Day poles. The Manager Style principal would score toward the Administrative Efficiency pole with more medial ratings on the Concern for People and Strategic Sense dimensions. The Initiator would score high on Formal Meaningful, Administrative Efficiency and Vision and Planning.

Following completion of the definitions of the three dimensions and the definitions of each pole work on identification of possible items for the CFS measure was initiated.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CFS QUESTIONNAIRE

Item development proceeded in two phases. The first was based upon making the design decision that teachers would be the ones to complete the questionnaire. The reasoning for this included the fact that with teachers there would be multiple sources of information about the facilitator style of the principal. Secondly, teachers are in a position to observe and experience the facilitator style of the principal on a day to day basis. Also, any other possible assessor, such as district office personnel, would not be in a position to appraise the day to day emphases of principals across a number of schools. Some individuals might have valid images, but in other

districts attempting to identify the "right" person would be expensive and in many cases impossible.

Once this design decision was made we (Hall and Vandenberghe) worked, over a period of twelve months, to develop an item pool. The items were drawn from field notes of descriptions of principal interventions, interviews with teachers, the intervention data that had been collected in the original Principal Teacher Interaction study and the subsequent replication studies in Australia, the U.S. and Belgium. The CFS Dimension and Pole definitions were used also as heuristics to develop potential items for a paper pencil questionnaire.

Item development began in April, 1986 and continued through the end of April, 1987. During April 1987, Hall and Vandenberghe pooled their sets of items and then went through a process of individually rating each item as to which dimension and which pole it was reflecting. Then the individual ratings were compared. Through this sorting process the wording of items was refined and a consensus rating for each item was determined.

As an additional development step, Vandenberghe (1988) translated the English statement of the items into Dutch for concurrent field testing of the CFS Questionnaire in Belgium.

Throughout the development of items and in the preparation of the questionnaire careful attention was given to selecting items that would fit standard questionnaire practice. Typical errors (such as including the word "not" in an item that would result in a double negative) were edited out. In addition, the prototype questionnaire was completed by several colleagues, graduate students and others to check for meaning and points of confusion in the items, the directions and response options.

It was decided that a six point Likert type scale would be used to indicate the teachers assessment of each item. The Likert scale is constructed as follows:

```
  1. . . . . 2. . . . . 3. . . . . 4. . . . 5 . . . .6
never      rarely    seldom    sometimes  often    always
 or                                                  or
not true                                          very true
```

Twelve to fourteen items were developed for each pole of each dimension. These items were evenly distributed across the pages of the questionnaire. A cover page of instructions to the teacher was designed and a demographic page was attached as a last page. In the end, seventy seven items were included on the field test form of the CFS Questionnaire.

Field testing of the CFS Questionnaire

In the fall of 1987 field test packets of the English version of the CFS Questionnaire were prepared and distributed to participating school districts, schools and teachers in the U.S. Vandenberghe (1988) used the same procedures with the Dutch version in Belgium. The packets included a cover letter to the principal and a copy of the questionnaire for themselves. Also included were separate packets for each teacher that included a cover letter, the questionnaire and a stamped envelope. Teachers were asked to mail their questionnaires in the envelope directly to the researcher.

For the field test of the English version, sample schools in four different school district contexts were selected. One was a district (7 schools) in a large mid-western city, the second was a small district (7 schools) in a small town in New England, the third was a large private school system (21 schools) in a major east coast metropolitan center, and the fourth was a large, county wide district (17 schools) in the south east.

In each district central office administrators were first approached about the feasibility of doing the study. They in turn asked their principals to assist in this effort. In large part the sample of principals and teachers was voluntary. In theory this means a risk of the sample being skewed away from Responder CF Style principals, since they stereo typically are less likely to volunteer or to follow through with their teachers. Fortunately, based on the written comments some teachers made on the CFS Questionnaire, it appears that some principals with Responder Style tendencies were included.

The percentage of returns of the questionnaire varied by district and school. Over seven hundred questionnaires were returned. The return rate by district varied from an average of 95% for the private schools to an average of 36% in the small New England district. A low return rate for a district was due mainly to some of the schools having 0% returns. For example, in the southeastern district two schools returned no questionnaires and eleven of seventeen had return rates of 40-82%.

Analysis of the CFS Responses

A total of 679 completed responses were received, representing 46 schools. The first step in the data analysis was to assess the degree to which the items written for each dimension measured a single concept. Because of the bi-polar nature of the dimensions, each item was treated as belonging to one of six scales -- one scale for each end of the three underlying dimensions. Each of these scales had from 12 to 14 items on the 77 item questionnaire.

SPSSX program RELIABILITY was used to assess the internal consistency of the set of items assigned to each scale. Table A shows

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

some results of the initial item analysis, based on 275 respondents who provided a rating of one through six on all 77 items.

Scale	initial # items	initial alpha	# items retained	resulting alpha
1	12	.50	6	.82
2	14	.92	11	.92
3	14	.78	6	.88
4	12	.94	11	.93
5	12	.84	8	.87
6	13	.92	12	.94

All retained items had corrected item-total correlations of .42 or higher on the initial scales. The one item that seems to define each scale, as indicated by having the highest item-total correlation, is as follows:

Concern for People

Social/Informal: Is primarily concerned with how teachers feel.

Formal/Meaningful: Discusses school problems in a meaningful way.

Organizational Efficiency

Trust in Others: Plans and procedures are introduced at the last moment.

Administrative Efficiency: Provides guidelines for efficient operation of the school.

Strategic Sense

Day to Day: Decisions are made with little connection to the overall picture.

Vision and Planning: S/he is heavily involved in what is happening with teachers and students.

From these analyses it was clear that most of the items written for each scale were grouping together well from the point of view of the respondents. That is, teachers rated their principals the same on the items assigned to each scale, even though the items were randomly sequenced on the questionnaire.

Those items which were not correlated with the other items on each scale provide additional insight into the behaviors of principals that were thought to indicate each dimension. For example, "Conversations with him/her are vague" was written for the Social/Informal scale, but correlates negatively with the other items on that scale. Indeed, this

item related best to the items on the Day to Day scale! Additional analyses of this type area proceeding.

When the scale scores are computed as the average of the responses to each item on the scale, the scale means and standard deviations are as follows, based on this same sample of 275 respondents.

	Mean	SD
Concern for People		
Social/Informal:	4.11	.93
Formal/Meaningful:	4.40	.93
Organizational Efficiency		
Trust in Others:	2.76	1.10
Administrative Efficiency:	4.83	.86
Strategic Sense		
Day to Day:	2.60	.99
Vision and Planning:	4.82	.87

These values indicate that the scales have roughly the same ranges of scores, in that the means are all between 2.60 and 4.83 and the standard deviations are all close to 1.0. The Trust in Others scale and the Day to Day scale have the lowest values, very likely because these scales are intended to measure concepts that are somewhat negative. In making comparisons between scales, however, the proper procedure would be to assess each principal's score on the scale relative to the score of a normative group. As these analyses continue, norms will be defined to allow a profile of each principal to be developed.

The concept of three underlying dimensions can be investigated by examining the inter-correlations of the scale scores. According to the theory, each scale is one pole on a bi-polar dimension. This would lead one to predict that the scores on the two scales under each dimension should be negatively correlated, and, ideally, the scores on scales under different dimensions would have low inter-correlations. The pattern of inter-correlations is:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Form/Mean	T-O	A-E	D-P	V-P
Social/Informal:	.51	-.32	.47	-.37	.52
Formal/Meaningful:		-.73	.86	-.75	.92
Trust in Others:			-.80	.83	-.75
Administrative Efficiency:				-.75	.91
Day to Day:					-.77

The pairs of scales on the three dimensions correlate .51, -.80, and -.77, which is very encouraging. The two scales on the Concern for People dimension are not as "clean" as we would like, but the other two dimensions seem to have clearly defined bi-polar scales. The "right hand" scales on all three dimensions are highly inter-correlated (.86, .92, and .91), perhaps more so than is desirable. Correlations of this magnitude lead one to question whether separate constructs are being measured. the "left hand" scales have a more complex pattern of inter-correlations (-.32, -.37, and .83). Analyses of these patterns are continuing, using a combination of factor and cluster analysis techniques. These analyses are indicating the construct validity of the scales as described in the paper. At this time we are very encouraged by the high alpha coefficients and intrigued by the inter-correlations among the scale scores.

In Summary

This paper began with an expression of optimism for the increasing attention that is being given to the study of school principals as instructional leaders. The review of the literature pointed out the rich and deep history of research and model building about leaders in industrial and military settings, as well as making reference to the recent studies of the role of the principal in change and school improvement. To do something useful in this area requires incorporation of the heritage and in some way rotating the study questions so that new light is directed on the phenomenon.

The work reported here represents a major departure in that the studies of principals as change facilitators began by looking at what happened to teachers who were engaged in implementing educational innovations. The initial studies were of teachers, not principals. The studies took place in schools not in unnatural laboratory settings. In the earlier studies major differences in teacher implementation success appeared to be directly linked with differences in what principals were and were not doing. The next round of studies documented the day to day interventions that principals made. Thus, the development of the three Change Facilitator Styles was grounded in what happened with teachers and careful documentation of what the principals were doing across time.

Indications of the validity of the three Change Facilitator Styles came early in the sharing of descriptions of the archetypes with practitioners. They quickly recognized principals they had known. However, they were quick to point out that the three CF styles did not include everyone. Support for the three CF styles was found in the leadership and school effectiveness literatures also. For example, the Responder Style has many of the characteristics of the Trust in Others leader and the Initiator has many of the characteristics of principals in effective schools.

Another source of confirmation for viewing the principals role as change facilitator in this way has come from the findings of the subsequent studies that have used the same research methods (Trohoski (1984), Schiller (1988), and Van der Perre (1984). In a set of recent case studies Marsh (1988) has observed similar patterns and associations with implementation.

Developing a questionnaire to assess CF Style has been the goal in the last two years. The first step in doing this was to develop a conceptual framework for organizing the style descriptions and array of behavioral indicators. The two dimensions Concern for People and Organizational Efficiency built on the earlier leadership models, while the Strategic Sense dimension represents a new element.

A valuable resource for development of the CFS questionnaire was the extensive data base of interventions from the earlier studies. These data provided the behavioral accounts for developing items that were grounded and related to the over-arching concepts. In

constructing items attention was given to making the items as behavioral as possible, yet realizing that each behavior is interpreted by the teacher in terms of their perception of the principal's style. This has meant that sometimes perception of intent is addressed also.

Further discussion

At this point it is not clear whether the CFS Questionnaire will work well enough to have long term practical use. At a minimum the development of the measure has tested the three dimension organizational framework with encouraging results. The structure has held together and the items appear to have consistency within each cluster.

The next steps in the development of the measure are to refine the scoring system and to conduct a validity study. Comparing the scale scores with informed judgements about the change facilitator emphases of selected principals will be extremely useful in developing a norms and scoring and reporting systems.

Both conceptually and practically, the creation of the Strategic Sense dimension has been important. This added dimension addresses the type of orientation that has been observed in the studies of more effective principals. Some principals think a lot about their past interventions and their relationship to the next interventions to be made. This visioning, as Barth (1988) calls it, is a key aspect of successful change facilitation.

Establishing a different approach to scaling the dimensions has been useful also. The simple scaling from a little to a lot was not acknowledging the shift in quality and character that had been observed in the principal studies. It is not simply a matter of the amount of relationship that occurs, it is more a matter of the kind and focus.

Another important next step will be to look closely at the Dutch version of the CFS Questionnaire (Vandenberghe, 1988). On first examination it appears that the findings in the two countries are very similar. This is encouraging for the work and is consistent with the results of our earlier cross cultural comparisons.

Leadership for change in schools is important everywhere. The Change Facilitator Style that the principal uses makes a difference in teacher success in implementation and through this student success. The more able we are to describe and conceptualize differences in their styles the better able we will be at helping principals and their schools develop even more successful approaches to continued school improving.

Figure 1. Descriptions of Three Change Facilitator Styles

Initiators have clear, decisive long-range policies and goals that transcend but include implementation of the current innovation. They tend to have very strong beliefs about what good schools and teaching should be like and work intensely to attain this vision. Decisions are made in relation to their goals for the school and in terms of what they believe to be best for students, which is based on current knowledge of classroom practice. Initiators have strong expectations for students, teachers and themselves. They convey and monitor these expectations through frequent contacts with teachers and clear explication of how the school is to operate and how teachers are to teach. When they feel it is in the best interest of their school, particularly the students, Initiators will seek changes in district programs or policies or they will reinterpret them to suit the needs of the school. Initiators will be adamant but not unkind, they solicit input from staff and then decisions are made in terms of the goals of the school, even if some are ruffled by their directness and high expectations.

Managers represent a broader range of behaviors. They demonstrate both responsive behaviors in answer to situations or people and they also initiate actions in support of the change effort. The variations in their behavior seem to be linked to their rapport with teachers and central office staff as well as how well they understand and buy into a particular change effort. Managers work without fanfare to provide basic support to facilitate teachers' use of an innovation. They keep teachers informed about decisions and are sensitive to teacher needs. They will defend their teachers from what are perceived as excessive demands. When they learn that the central office wants something to happen in their school they then become very involved with their teachers in making it happen. Yet, they do not typically initiate attempts to move beyond the basics of what is imposed.

Responders place heavy emphasis on allowing teachers and others the opportunity to take the lead. They believe their primary role is to maintain a smooth running school by focusing on traditional administrative tasks, keeping teachers content and treating students well. They view teachers as strong professionals who are able to carry out their instructional role with little guidance. Responders emphasize the personal side of their relationships with teachers and others. Before they make decisions they often give everyone an opportunity to have input so as to weigh their feelings or to allow others to make the decision. A related characteristic is the tendency toward making decisions in terms of immediate circumstances rather than in terms of longer range instructional or school goals. This seems to be due in part to their desire to please others and in part to their more limited vision of how their school and staff should change in the future.

Hall, G. E., Rutherford, W. L., Hord, S. M., & Huling, L. L. Effects of three principal styles on school improvement. Educational Leadership, 41(5), February, 1984, 222-29.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Figure 2. Change Facilitator Style Questionnaire For Principals
Dimension descriptions

I. CONCERN FOR PEOPLE

People have feelings and attitudes about their work and change. They have personal needs too. Principals can monitor, attend to and affect these concerns and needs in different ways and with different emphases. For example, it is possible to spend little time in directly addressing the feelings of others or to become preoccupied with listening to and responding to each concern that is expressed. The emphasis can be on attending to individual concerns as they are expressed day to day, or focus on more enduring needs of all staff, with attention to individual concerns only when these are major to the person and have the potential of affecting over all performance.

The Concern for People dimension addresses the degree to which the facilitator emphasizes social/informal to more formal/meaningful interactions with clients. At one extreme the discussions with clients deal mostly with moment to moment topics and many of the topics of interaction are unrelated to work. When work related topics are dealt with, it is done in more informal and superficial ways. At this "social/informal" end contacts tend to be loosely coupled and general in focus.

At the formal/meaningful end of the dimension facilitator discussions have a heavy task focus and most contacts with clients are centered around work related topics. Interventions are interconnected and the primary emphasis is on the tasks at hand. Casual social discussions are infrequent. However, when there are significant personal needs these are addressed in ways that are meaningful to those that are affected.

Social/Informal

A facilitator that emphasizes this end of the dimension believes that attending to feelings, open discussions of questions and problems are the important focii. A great deal of time and energy is invested in probing to find out what people inside and outside the school think and feel. This attention to feelings and perceptions is focused more on listening, trying to understand and acknowledging immediate concerns than in providing answers or anticipating long range consequences. There is a personable, friendly, almost chatty, tone to many of the interactions. When concerns are addressed for resolution it is done in ways that are responsive rather than anticipatory and the emphasis is on being personal and friendly rather than task oriented.

Formal/Meaningful

The general orientation of a principal that emphasizes this end of the dimension is to have interactions that center on school priorities and directions. Discussions and interactions are focused

on teaching and learning and substantive issues. The interactions are primarily intended to support teachers in their school related tasks. In his/her interactions the principal is almost always looking for solutions that are lasting.

There is an awareness of the general pattern of feelings and perceptions of the staff. However, the interactions of the principal are not overly influenced by superficial and short lived feelings and needs of people; instead they maintain their emphasis on the teaching and learning activities. When personal concerns and feeling are attended to it is done in ways that are personally meaningful.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL EFFICIENCY

Accomplishing the work of the organization can be facilitated with varying degrees of emphasis on obtaining resources, increasing efficiency and consolidating/sharing responsibilities and authority. Principals can try to do most everything themselves or they can delegate most of it. System procedures, role clarity, work priorities can be made more or less clear and resources organized in ways that increase/decrease availability and effectiveness. The tasks are there, what the leader does him/her self, how priorities are set, how resources are obtained and allocated, what others do and how their efforts combine directly affect the abilities of the staff to accomplish their assigned work. In this dimension the principals administrative focus is viewed on a continuum that ranges from high administrative efficiency, by creating and making supportive procedures and systems, to high trust in others through casual, informal and less consistent articulation of procedures and delegation of tasks.

Trust in Others

Locating resources, establishing procedures and managing schedules and time are done loosely and in- efficiently. Decisions are delayed to allow everyone to have input. Administrative systems and procedures are allowed to evolve in response to needs as they are expressed by staff and in response to external pressures. There is an assumption by the principal that others (teachers) know how to accomplish their jobs and that there should be a minimum of structuring and monitoring by the principal. As needs for additions or changes in structures, rules, and procedures emerge they are gradually acknowledged and changes are introduced as suggestions and guidelines rather than by directly establishing new procedures and policies . Formalizing procedural and policy changes are left to others and time.

Administrative Efficiency

Establishing clear procedures and resource systems to help teachers and others do their jobs efficiently is the priority. The

emphasis is on having clear procedures, available resources and a smoothly running organization. The expectation is that administration, scheduling and production tasks should be clearly described and understood and used by all members of the organization. It is believed that with high levels of organizational efficiency teachers can do their jobs better. It is believed that through administrative support the work of others in the organization can be at its best. As needs for new structures and procedures emerge they are established.

III. STRATEGIC SENSE

To varying degrees principals keep in mind an image of the long term view and its relationship to the monthly, weekly and daily activities of themselves and their school. Some principals are more "now" focused, while others think and act with a vivid mental image of how todays actions contribute to accomplishing long term goals. Some are reflective about what they are doing and how all of their activity can add up, while others focus on the moment to moment, treating each event in isolation from its part in the grand scheme. This visioning encompanies the entry and role of external facilitators too. In some settings external facilitators can enter schools as they wish, while in other settings the principal encourages/discourages their entry and prescribes their role.

Day to Day

At this end of the dimension there is little anticipation of future developments and needs or possible successes/failures. Interventions are made in response to issues and needs as they arise. Knowledge of the details of use of the innovation is limited and the amount of intervening is restricted to responding to questions and gradually completing routine steps. Images of how things could be better and how more rapid movement could be made to gain these ends are incomplete, limited in scope and lack imagination. Structures and solutions are devised "on the spot" as needs arise. These are done with little adjustment or anticipation of longer term patterns, trends or consequences. External facilitators come and go as they wish and spend extraordinary effort in advising the principal.

Vision and Planning

The orientation of this pole is that of having a long term vision that is integrated with an understanding of how the day to day activities are the means that accumulate toward the desired end. There is an intensity to the facilitating activity, with a high degree of interaction that is related to the work at hand. Teachers and others are pushed to accomplish all that they can. Assertive leadership, continual monitoring, commitment to action, and creative interpretations of policy and uses of resources to accomplish longer term goals are clear indicators of this end of the dimension. Also present is the ability to anticipate the possible systematic effects of interventions and the longer term consequences of day to day actions. Effects are accurately predicted and interventions are made in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

anticipation of likely trends. Interactions with staff and external facilitators are centered on the work at hand. The focus is on tasks, accomplishing school objectives and making continued progress. External facilitators are encouraged/discouraged to be involved in the school according to the principal's perception of the areas of expertise and worth.

REFERENCES

Barth, R. s. (1988). Principals, Teachers, and School Leadership. Phi Delta Kappan. Vol. 69. No. 9.

Bass, M. B. (1981). Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership. The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Publishing CO., Inc., New York.

Blake, R. R., and Mouton, J. S. (1964). The managerial grid. Houston: Gulf.

Brookover and Lezotte, (1977).

Edmonds, R. (1979, October). Effective schools for the urban poor. Reprinted by permission of CEMREL, Inc.

Fiedler, F. E. (1977). Situational control and dynamic theory of leadership. In B. King, F. E. Fiedler, and S. Streufert (Eds.), Managerial control and organizational democracy. Washington, D.C.: W. H. Winston & Sons.

Greenfield, W. E. (1982). Empirical research on principals: The state of the art. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, NY.

Hall, G. E. (1987). Strategic Sense: The key to reflective leadership in school principals. Paper presented at the Conference on Reflection in Teacher Education. Houston, TX.

Hall, G. E. & Hord, S. M. (1987). Change in Schools: Facilitating the Process. State University of New York Press, Albany, New York .

Hall, G. E., Hord, S. M. & Griffin, T. H. (1980). Implementation at the school building level: The development and analysis of nine mini-case studies. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Hall, G. E., Rutherford, W. L., Hord, S. M. & Huling-Austin, L. L. (1984). Effects of three principal styles on school improvement. Educational Leadership, 41(5), 22-29.

Hall, G. E., Wallace, R. C. & Dossett, W. A. (1973). A developmental conceptualization of the adoption process within educational institutions. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Hemphill, J. K. (1950). Leader behavior description. Columbus: Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board, (mimeo).

Hersey, P., and Blanchard, K. H. (1977). Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources. (3d. ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Huling, L. L. Hall, G. E., Hord, S. M. & Rutherford, W. L. (1983). A multi-dimensional approach for assessing implementation success (Report No. 3157). Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250 328).

Leithwood, K. A. & Montgomery, D. J. (1983). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. Review of Educational Research, Vol. 52, No. 3.

Lewin, K., and Lippitt, R. (1938). An experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy:a preliminary note. Sociometry, 1, 292-300.
CO., Inc., New York.

Marsh, C. J. (1988). Division A. Symposium: Analyzing and measuring principal facilitator style during school improvement efforts. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans. Murdoch University.

Rutherford, B. (1988). Distinguishing three change facilitator styles from an analysis of principal interventions. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Schiller, J. (1988). The relationship of principal interventions to teacher success in implementing computer education. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, LA.

Schone, D. (1983). The reflective practitioner. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Thomas, M. A. (1978). A study of alternatives in American education, Vol. II: The role of the principal. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corp.

Trohoski, C. G. (1984). Principals' interventions in the implementation of a school health program: Three case studies. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Vandenberghe, R. (1988). Development of a framework and measure (in Dutch) for assessing principal change facilitator style. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, LA.

Van der Perre. (1984). Principals as change facilitators: The role of the elementary school principal in Belgium. Leuven, Belgium: The Catholic University.